REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 29, 2006. Claims 2-10, 14, 16, 18, 29 and 30 are pending.

Claim 10 stands rejected under Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takayama in view of alleged Admitted Prior Art (APA) in the background section of the instant application. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 requires that the "voltage application means applies said prescribed electric fields in a manner such that said prescribed electric fields are always ***different from one another in polarity in all adjacent electrode pair regions, including electrode pair regions in different but adjacent columns and electrode pair regions in different but adjacent rows of the EL emission device, and vary in a time-dependent manner, so that adjacent electrode pair regions in different columns and adjacent electrode pair regions in different rows are always driven in different polarity***. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

In the Office Action dated September 29, 2006, the Examiner contends that in Takayama the only electrode pair regions which are "adjacent" to each other are those (e.g., e1 and e2) in the *same* pixel. The Examiner then contends that since the elements e1 and e2 in the same pixel are driven with opposite polarity, then claim 10 is met by Takayama and that adjacent rows and columns can be ignored. While applicant may not agree with the Examiner's interpretation of Takayama in this respect, claim 10 has been amended to prevent such an interpretation.

Takayama provides a pair of EL elements in parallel with opposite polarities so that when voltage supplied to the elements is positive a first element emits light and when it is negative the other element emits light (col. 7, lines 5-12). However, Takayama does not disclose or suggest applying electric fields in a manner such that said electric fields are always different from one

another in polarity in all adjacent electrode pair regions, so that adjacent electrode pair regions in different columns and adjacent electrode pair regions in different rows are always driven in different polarity, as required by claim 10.

Table 4 in col. 8 of Takayama makes clear that the electric fields applied to adjacent electrode pair regions are *not* always different in polarity. For instance, at time t1 in Table 3 of Takayama, the same polarity is applied to all row electrodes and the same polarity is applied to all column electrodes; thus, adjacent electrode pair regions in different columns and adjacent electrode pair regions in different rows are *not* always driven in different polarity in Takayama – thus, Takayama discloses the opposite of what claim 10 requires. Accordingly, Takayama *fails* to disclose or suggest that adjacent electrode pair regions in adjacent different columns and adjacent electrode pair regions in adjacent different rows are always driven in different polarity. As another example, at time t3 in Table 3 of Takayama, the same polarity is applied to adjacent row electrodes R1 and R2 and the same polarity is applied to all column electrodes; thus, the electric fields applied to all adjacent electrode pair regions in adjacent rows and adjacent columns cannot possibly always be different in polarity at time t3 as required by claim 10.

In particular, Figs. 1 and 2A of Takayama disclose that each cell EL comprises a pair of display elements e1 and e2 coupled in parallel with opposite polarities; Fig. 2 shows that those elements e1 and e2 (reversely connected) in each pixel EL neighbor each other. However, according to Figs. 1 and 2A of Takayama, element e1 of pixel EL11 and element e1 of pixel EL21 neighbor each other; and when voltages are applied according to Table 4 the same voltage of the same polarity is applied at times t1 and t3 to element e1 of pixel EL11 and element e1 of pixel EL21 which neighbor each other. Again, Takayama *fails* to disclose or suggest that

adjacent electrode pair regions in adjacent different columns and adjacent electrode pair regions in adjacent different rows are always driven in different polarity.

Thus, because Takayama applies the same polarity to neighboring pixels in the same row (and in the same column, and e.g., to neighboring elements e1 as discussed above), the reference cannot possibly disclose or suggest the requirement of claim 10. Citation to the APA cannot cure the aforesaid flaws in Takayama. Thus, even the alleged combination (which applicant believes to be incorrect in any event) fails to meet the invention of claim 10.

Claim 14 also requires that "prescribed electric fields at a given point in time are always different from each other in polarity as applied to all electrode pair regions that are adjacent to each other, including electrode pair regions in different but adjacent columns and electrode pair regions in different but adjacent rows of the EL emission device, so that adjacent electrode pair regions in adjacent different columns and adjacent electrode pair regions in adjacent different rows are always driven in different polarity." The cited art fails to disclose or suggest these features of claim 14, either taken alone or in the alleged combination.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100